

To: Bernie Hurley, Chair SOPAG

From: Patrick Dawson, LAUC SOPAG representative, Santa Barbara

Re: Comments on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report

Two open meetings for all library employees were held, on Thursday March 2nd Friday March 3rd 2006. In those two meetings, the task force report was discussed and the recommendations were rated. The results of each meeting are listed separately. Time did not allow for all 6 sections to be addressed that were included in the Invitation to ACGs, LAUC and SOPAG sent from Bernie Hurley as SOPAG chair on February 6, 2006.

March 2nd session:

1. Recommendation II.1 and II.2 were ranked equally as first.
2. Recommendation III.1
3. Recommendation I.1
4. Recommendation I.4

The following were also noted as important but were not ranked:
I.3; I.5 and I.7 were noted to be equally important; I.8; III.2

Below are some of the narrative comments that came out of the session when posed with the question *If we pursue these recommendations, what does it mean to workflow and to the OPAC:*

- I am out of a job
- The OPAC will no longer be the OPAC but an integrated system; however, we will still need to circulate materials and be able to bill patrons, so these features will need to be accommodated.
- There will need to be re-training, policies will need to be re-written and the workflow will need to be reorganized among the campuses
- This will mean an investment in time and resources.
- This will necessitate a fundamental cultural change in the libraries; however, the culture is already changing around us so it is incumbent upon us to change too.

March 3rd session:

1. Recommendation II.1 and II.2 were ranked equally as first
2. Recommendation III.1
3. Recommendation III.3
4. Recommendation I.1
5. Recommendation IV.1
6. Recommendation I.3

7. Recommendation I.4
8. Recommendation I.5
9. Recommendation I.8

Below are some of the narrative comments that came out of the session when posed with the question *If we pursue these recommendations, what does it mean to workflow and to the OPAC:*

We must be able to preserve local information, such as books on order, in process materials and serial holdings.

We will still need to have the ability to enhance local records and have control over local unique records.

In search results will need an indicator for the source of information presented, so the patron is able to go to the source.

Concern was expressed over Recommendation III.2 that this would mean abandoning subject headings.

In this scenario, people and time would be freed up to work on enhancing local records if there were more central basic cataloging.

The University will need to develop the bibliographic standards to use and all campuses will need to follow these standards.

Individual libraries will still need the ability to deal with unique items.

This will mean extensive retraining for all.

How will acquisitions and local accounting and cataloging still be unique to each campus?

The OPAC will be more of a 'search window' for information.

In all of this we don't want to impose more complexity upon our users.

One nice feature would be to group results by format such as is done in WorldCat.

The perfect search screen would be a single screen that would accommodate all browsers and eliminate a need for scrolling.

All of this will need to be compatible with printers.

Whatever is developed should be open source and depend as little as possible on outside companies and on specialized code and databases. The whole lot needs to be Internet based.